REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1-8 and 10-37 stand rejected. Applicants gratefully acknowledge Examiner's indication that claim 9 includes allowable subject matter. By the above amendment, claims 1, 15, 22, 24, 26, 29, 30 and 33 have been amended. The Examiner's reconsideration of the claims rejections is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

ANTICIPATION REJECTIONS

Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22, 23, 25-34 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,678,790 to Kumar. Claims 1, 10-14 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,321,318 to Baltz.

Applicants respectfully submit that at the very minimum, claim 1 is patentably distinct and patentable over Kumar and Baltz. In particular, by way of example, neither Kumar nor Baltz discloses a configurable memory that comprises *a memory array in which both tag bits and data bits are stored in a single data line in the memory array*, in a first mode of operation where the configurable memory operates as a cache, as essentially recited in claim 1.

This is rather evident from the express teachings of Kumar, which discloses separate tag arrays (50, 70/72) and data arrays (52, 74/76), such as depicted in FIGs. 2 and 3 of Kumar. Moreover, Baltz teaches separate tag memories (33, 32) (FIG. 9) of a memory controller (30) that are distinct from the memory array (31) (see FIG. 1). Accordingly, for at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentably distinct from Baltz and Kumar.

Furthermore, although Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejections of claims 22, 26, 30, and 33, these claims have been amended to include subject matter that is similar to that of claim 9, which Examiner has indicated includes allowable subject matter. For instance, claims

- 11 -

22, 26, 30, and 33 essentially recite that the different operating modes can be *selected during a program execution based on comparing a supplied address to at least one address range contained in at least one configuration register*. Accordingly, 22, 26, 30, and 33 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Furthermore, all pending claims that depend from claims 1, 22, 26, 30 and 33, which are rejected as being anticipated by <u>Kumar</u> and/or <u>Baltz</u>, are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependence from respective base claims 1, 22, 26, 30 or 33. Accordingly, withdrawal of the anticipation rejections is respectfully requested.

OBVIOUSNESS REJECTIONS

Claim 24 stands rejected as being unpatentable over <u>Kumar</u> in view of U.S. Patent 6,377,912 to <u>Sample</u>, or in the alternative in view of US Patent 6,611,796 to <u>Natarajan</u>, Claims 34 and 35 stand rejected as being unpatentable over <u>Kumar</u> in view of US Patent 6,426,549 to <u>Isaak</u>,

Claim 24 depends from claim 22 and claims 34 and 35 depend from claim 33. Claims 22 and 33 are believed to be in condition for allowance for the reasons stated above. As such, the obviousness rejections are believed to be moot in that claims 24, 34 and 35 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 22 and 33, respectively. Accordingly, withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Frank V. DeRosa
Reg. No. 43,584

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
TEL.: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889